72-676 FILE COPY

No. _____

FILED

NOV 1 1972

MICHAEL RODAK, JR., CLERK

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

72-676

OCTOBER TERM, 1972

STEVEN LYLE CRAIG,
Petitioner,

vs.

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF COLORADO,
Respondent.

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF COLORADO

WILLIAM LEWIS
1839 York Street
Denver, Colorado

NATALIE S. ELLWOOD
328 West 13th Avenue
Denver, Colorado 80204

HENRY V. ELLWOOD
1839 York Street
Denver, Colorado

INDEX

	Page
OPINION BELOW	2
JURISDICTION	2
DATE OF JUDGMENT AND TIME OF ENTRY	2
DATE OF ORDER GRANTING AN EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE THE PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI	2
QUESTIONS PRESENTED	2
STATUTES AND CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS INVOLVED	3
CONCISE STATEMENT OF THE CASE	4
ARGUMENT	5
CONCLUSION	12

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A - Decision by the Supreme Court of Colorado	13
APPENDIX B - C.R.S. 40-2-3 (1963)	17

AUTHORITIES

CASES

	Page
Ballard v. United States, 329 U.S. 187 (1946).	11
Chesnut v. New York, 370 F.2d 1 (1st Cir. 1966)	11
Furman v. Georgia, 40 LW 4923 (June 29, 1972, Case No. 69-5003)	7, 9
Glasser v. United States, 315 U.S. 60 (1942).	10
Griggs v. Duke Power, 401 U.S. 424 (1971).	8
Hernandez v. Texas, 347 U.S. 475 (1945).	9
Lobat v. Bennett, 365 F.2d 698 (1966) .	11
Norris v. Alabama, 294 U.S. 597 (1935).	9
People v. Anderson, 6 Cal. 3rd 628, 493 P.2d 880 (1972)	7
Smith v. Texas, 311 U.S. 128 (1940). .	11
Thiel v. Southern Pacific Company, 328 U.S. 217 (1946)	9
Witherspoon v. United States, 391 U.S. 510 (1968)	6

STATUTES

C.R.S. 40-2-3 (1963)	4
C.R.S. 40-7-35 (1963)	4
C.R.S. 49-3-1(1) (1963).	10

AUTHORITIES (continued)

LEGAL PERIODICALS

Page

Edgar J. Bronson, On the Conviction Proneness and Representativeness of a Death Qualified Jury: An Empirical Study of Colorado Veniremen, 42 Colorado Law Review 1 (May, 1970). 6

George L. Jurou, New Data on the Effect of a Death Qualified Jury on the Guilt Determination Process, 84 Harvard Law Review 567 (January, 1971) 6

MISCELLANEOUS

Sixth Amendment to the United States Constitution 3

Eighth Amendment to the United States Constitution 3

Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution 3

No. _____

IN THE
SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
OCTOBER TERM, 1972

STEVEN LYLE CRAIG,
Petitioner,

vs.

THE PEOPLE OF THE
STATE OF COLORADO,
Respondent.

PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF COLORADO

Steven Lyle Craig, your Petitioner, prays that a Writ of Certiorari issue to review the Judgment of the Supreme Court of the State of Colorado, entered in the above-entitled case, on July 3, 1972, affirming the Petitioner's conviction of First-Degree Murder and Conspiracy to Commit First-Degree Murder in violation of C.R.S. 40-2-3 (1963) and C.R.S. 40-7-35 (1963).

OPINION BELOW

The Opinion of the Supreme Court of the State of Colorado was entered on July 3, 1972 (Appendix A, infra).

JURISDICTION

The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked under 28 U.S.C. § 1257 (3).

DATE OF JUDGMENT AND TIME OF ENTRY

The Judgment of the Supreme Court of the State of Colorado was entered on July 3, 1972.

DATE OF ORDER GRANTING AN EXTENSION OF TIME TO FILE THE PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI

An extension of time to file the Petition for Writ of Certiorari was granted by this Court on October 2, 1972, extending the time to and including October 31, 1972.

QUESTIONS PRESENTED FOR REVIEW

I. Was Petitioner's right to a trial by a fair and impartial jury as guaranteed by the Sixth and Fourteenth Amendments to the United States Constitution violated by permitting the prosecutor to challenge for cause prospective jurors with scruples against the death penalty?

II. Was Petitioner's right to a trial by a fair and impartial jury violated by the selection

of the array of jurors solely from the list of registered voters in the county?

STATUTES AND CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS INVOLVED

Sixth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

AMENDMENT VI - In all criminal prosecutions, the accused shall enjoy the right to a speedy and public trial, by an impartial jury of the State and district wherein the crime shall have been committed, which district shall have been previously ascertained by law, and to be informed of the nature and cause of the accusation; to be confronted with the witnesses against him; to have compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in his favor, and to have the assistance of counsel for his defense.

Eighth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

AMENDMENT VIII - Excessive bail shall not be required, nor excessive fines imposed, nor cruel and unusual punishments inflicted.

Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States:

AMENDMENT XIV, Section 1 - All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No state shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or

immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

C.R.S. 40-2-3(1) (1963) (Appendix B, infra)

CONCISE STATEMENT OF THE CASE

On October 6, 1969, Steven Lyle Craig, hereafter referred to as the Petitioner, was charged along with several other individuals with the crimes of First Degree Murder, C.R.S. 40-2-3(1963) and Conspiracy to Commit to Murder C.R.S. 40-7-35 (1963). (ff. 3-5) The Petitioner entered a plea of not guilty to the charges and stood trial before the Honorable G. Russell Miller in the State District Court of Colorado Springs, Colorado on May 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16 and 18, 1970 (ff. 34, 215)

The Petitioner was tried by a jury of twelve (12) jurors selected from a jury panel compiled by the Jury Commissioner solely from the voter registration lists of El Paso County, Colorado. (ff. 227-238) Prior to the jury selection, the Petitioner objected to the composition of the jury panel from which the jury was to be chosen. (ff. 273-278) Petitioner contended that he was denied due process of law in the selection of a jury drawn exclusively from the list of registered voters in the county. The trial court overruled Petitioner's objection and the trial commenced.

The Petitioner objected during the voir dire to the seventeen (17) challenges for cause granted to the prosecution by the trial court.

The seventeen challenges for cause pertained to prospective jurors who stated they held scruples against imposing the death penalty. (ff. 273-278, 282-283, 284-286, 764-773, 814-818, 818-824, 824-829, 918-924, 1052-1059, 1138-1145, 1226-1234, 1327-1335, 1366-1373, 1536-1543, 1604-1629, 1711-1719, 1750-1754.) The Petitioner exhausted his allowed peremptory challenges. (f. 1748).

The Petitioner was convicted on May 18, 1970 and sentenced by the jury to life imprisonment on the charge of First-Degree Murder. (ff. 3208). The jury also found the Petitioner guilty of Conspiracy to Commit Murder and on June 30, 1970 the trial judge imposed the life sentence on the Petitioner and, in addition, the trial court sentenced Petitioner to not less than seven years nor more than ten years in the Colorado State Penitentiary on the Conspiracy count. (ff. 166-167, 193-194, 196-200)

On July 7, 1970, a notice of appeal was filed (ff. 202-203). On July 3, 1972 the Colorado Supreme Court affirmed the Petitioner's conviction of both First-Degree Murder and Conspiracy to Commit Murder, (Appendix A, infra).

ARGUMENT

I.

PETITIONER'S RIGHT TO A TRIAL BY A FAIR AND IMPARTIAL JURY UNDER THE SIXTH AND FOURTEENTH AMENDMENTS WAS VIOLATED BY PERMITTING THE JURY TO BE DEATH QUALIFIED.

A. NEW DATA ESTABLISHES THAT A DEATH QUALIFIED JURY IS CONVICTION PRONE.

In Witherspoon v. United States, 391 U.S. 510 (1968), the Court held that the penalty of death imposed by a jury in which all those having scruples against the death penalty were excluded was invalid because it was a sentence imposed by an unfair, partial, "hanging jury". The Court refused, however, to hold that a death qualified jury was conviction prone, expressly holding open that question. It is submitted that the question should now be decided in the instant case. Studies by social scientists since the date of the Witherspoon decision have unearthed significant new data.

First, there is the study by Edgar J. Bronson entitled On the Conviction Proneness and Representativeness of a Death Qualified Jury: An Empirical Study of Colorado Veniremen, 42 Colorado Law Review 1 (May, 1970). In the Bronson study a large number of jurors were polled on their attitudes regarding both the death penalty and their tendency to convict a person of a crime. Bronson concluded that there was a statistically significant correlation between conviction proneness and lack of scruples against the death penalty.

Even more significant is an article by George L. Jurou, New Data on the Effect of a Death Qualified Jury on the Guilt Determination Process, 84 Harvard Law Review 567, (January, 1971). The Jurou article contains a comprehensive discussion of the previous studies and articles and contains a careful study performed by Jurou under a grant from the United States Department of Justice. Like

the Bronson study, the Jurou study finds a significant, statistical correlation between lack of scruples against imposing the death penalty and conviction proneness.

When the Court in Witherspoon refused to hold that a death qualified jury was conviction prone, death was a penalty that could be imposed in most of the jurisdictions in the United States. Now, in light of Furman v. Georgia, 40 LW 4923, (June 29, 1972, Case No. 69-5003), there is substantial doubt whether the imposition of the death penalty is constitutional. See also People v. Anderson, 6 Cal. 3rd 628, 493 P.2d 880 (1972). Thus, there is apparently no constitutionally permissible state interest in permitting challenges for cause based upon opposition to the death penalty. The numerous studies indicating a correlation between conviction proneness and the unscrupled juror take on new significance.

Perhaps the Court's reluctance to rule on whether the unscrupled juror was conviction prone in Witherspoon was understandable in light of the fact that as of the date of that decision the death penalty was apparently a constitutionally permissible mode of punishment. Since the death penalty has apparently been ruled unconstitutional there is no reason to avoid making the obvious finding that the unscrupled juror is conviction prone to the detriment of the accused's right to a trial by a fair and impartial jury.

As Mr. Justice Douglas stated in his concurring opinion in Witherspoon, "[W]e do not require a showing of specific prejudice when a defendant has been deprived of his right to a jury representing a cross-section of the

community." 391 U.S. at p. 531. In the instant case 24% of the panel or seventeen (17) jurors were successfully challenged by the district attorney because of scruples they held against the death penalty. However, the studies establishing a correlation between conviction proneness and lack of scruples against the death penalty amount to a showing of specific prejudice.

In light of this Court's condemnation of the death penalty there is now no reason to avoid making the finding that individuals who lack scruples against imposing the death penalty are conviction prone. Mr. Justice Douglas in his concurring opinion in Witherspoon comments on the difficulty of showing concrete proof of prejudice. This difficulty has been recognized in employment discrimination cases where a showing of statistical trends was held by this Court sufficient proof to establish a prima facie case of employment discrimination. Griggs v. Duke Power, 401 U.S. 424 (1971). It is submitted that due to a large number of variables, a similar difficulty of showing clear and convincing proof is presented in establishing a correlation between conviction proneness and the unscrupled juror. Since there is now no legitimate interest in preserving the death penalty, this court should now accept the available proof showing a correlation between conviction proneness and the unscrupled juror.

B. SINCE THE DEATH PENALTY HAS BEEN RULED UNCONSTITUTIONAL, DEATH QUALIFICATION OF JURORS IS UNCONSTITUTIONAL AND DEPRIVES THE ACCUSED OF HIS RIGHT TO A TRIAL BY A FAIR AND IMPARTIAL JURY.

It is submitted that even if the new data cited to this Court concerning conviction proneness of unscrupled jurors is insufficient to persuade this Court, Petitioner's right to a trial by a fair and impartial jury in the instant case was abridged by qualification of the jury by the prosecution for the death penalty.

It is submitted that qualification of the jury was improper in light of the Court's decision in Furman v. Georgia, 40 LW 4923, (June 29, 1972, Case No. 69-5003). Any time people are arbitrarily excluded from juries by the state, the accused's right to a trial by a fair and impartial jury has been abridged, even absent a specific showing of prejudice. Norris v. Alabama, 294 U.S. 597 (1935) (jury exclusion of Negroes); Hernandez v. Texas, 347 U.S. 475 (1945) (exclusion on the basis of national origin); Thiel v. Southern Pacific Company, 328 U.S. 217 (1946) (exclusion of wage earners). Since 24% of the panel or seventeen jurors were successfully challenged for cause on an improper basis in the instant case, Petitioner's constitutional right to a trial by a fair and impartial jury representing a cross-section of the community was violated.

II.

PETITIONER'S RIGHT TO A TRIAL BY A FAIR AND IMPARTIAL JURY WAS VIOLATED BY THE SELECTION OF THE ARRAY OF JURORS SOLELY FROM THE LIST OF REGISTERED VOTERS IN THE COUNTY.

Petitioner has an absolute right to a trial by a fair and impartial jury representing a cross-section of the community. In compiling

the jury panel in this case solely from the list of registered voters in El Paso County the State of Colorado abridged this right. The requirements for voter registration in El Paso County were at the time of trial that the voter must be twenty-one (21) years of age or older, a resident in the precinct where registered for at least thirty-two (32) days, one year residence in the State of Colorado and must have either registered to vote or have voted in the last election. See C.R.S. 49-3-1(1) (1963). Thus, the method of jury selection in the instant case excluded the person who has recently moved within the State of Colorado, or has within one year moved to the State of Colorado, or the person who fails to register to vote or who has not voted in the last election. A long line of cases forbids exclusion of qualified groups from jury service. If the exclusion is wrongful, defendant does not even have to show prejudice. In Glasser v. United States, 315 U.S. 60, (1942), this Court roundly condemned the practice of drawing women jurors from the membership of the League of Women Voters.

> No matter how high-principled and imbued with a desire to inculcate public virtue such organization may be, the dangers inherent in such a method of selection are the more real when the members of those organizations from training or otherwise, acquire a bias in favor of the prosecution. The jury selected from the membership of such organization is then not only the organ of a special class, but in addition, it is openly partisan. If such practices are to be countenanced, the hard won right of trial

> by jury becomes a thing of doubtful value lacking one of the essential characteristics that have made it a cherished feature of our institutions. . . . 315 U.S. at 86.

Other examples of improper jury selection are condemned in the following cases: Smith v. Texas, 311 U.S. 128 (1940) (exclusion on basis of color); Ballard v. United States, 329 U.S. 187 (1946) (exclusion on basis of sex); Chesnut v. New York, 370 F.2d 1 (1st Cir. 1966) (exclusion on basis of color); Lobat v. Bennett, 365 F.2d 698, (1966) (exclusion on basis of economic status).

Although it is not necessary to show prejudice to the accused where there has been improper jury selection, there is little doubt that the Petitioner's right to a fair and impartial jury was prejudiced in the case before the Court. The record reveals that Petitioner had just moved to Colorado, however, he was tried by longtime Colorado residents and, in fact, only residents of the state for one year or more could qualify for the jury panel. Petitioner was not registered to vote due to his age, but he was tried by only registered voters.

It is submitted that the El Paso Jury Commissioner violated the Petitioner's constitutional right to a fair and impartial jury as guaranteed to him in the Sixth Amendment of the United States Constitution and as applied to the states through the Fourteenth Amendment of the United States Constitution by calling for jury service only individuals registered to vote in El Paso County. There is no rational basis for assuming that non-voters or residents of the state for less than one year would not be

adequate jurors in a court of law. The Jury Commissioner arbitrarily excluded qualified persons from the jury panel.

CONCLUSION

The Court is urged to grant this Petition for Writ of Certiorari based upon the following grounds: that a substantial federal question is presented in this Petition, i.e. whether the jury selection process employed by the State of Colorado in Petitioner's case was unconstitutional and violated his right to a fair and impartial jury by excluding prospective jurors who held scruples against imposing the death penalty; that since the death penalty is no longer considered by this Court to be a constitutional punishment for a crime, it logically follows that by excluding all persons who had scruples against the death penalty on the jury which sat in Petitioner's case the State of Colorado denied him the right to a fair and impartial jury; that the method of selection of the jury array was unconstitutional by excluding all non-voters.

Respectfully submitted,

WILLIAM LEWIS
1839 York Street
Denver, Colorado

NATALIE S. ELLWOOD
328 West 13th Avenue
Denver, Colorado 80204

HENRY V. ELLWOOD
1839 York Street
Denver, Colorado

APPENDIX A

No. 25011

The PEOPLE of the State of Colorado,
Plaintiff-Appellee,
v.
Steven Lyle CRAIG,
Defendant-Appellant,

July 3, 1972
En Banc

Appeal from the District Court of the County of El Paso, Hon. G. Russell Miller, Judge, Judgment affirmed.

Duke W. Dunbar, Attorney General, John P. Moore, Deputy Attorney General, Richard G. McManus, Jr., Assistant Attorney General, for plaintiff-appellee, Peter H. Ney for defendant-appellant.

MR. JUSTICE HODGES delivered the opinion of the Court.

The defendant, Steven Lyle Craig, was convicted by a jury of first-degree murder and conspiracy to commit first-degree murder. He was sentenced to the state penitentiary for life. On appeal, he advances three contentions which he maintains require a reversal of his conviction. We do not find any of these contentions to be meritorious and we therefore affirm the judgment of the trial court. Inasmuch as defendant's arguments relate to legal and procedural matters, it is unnecessary to set forth the circumstances of this brutal homicide.

I.

The defendant first argues that it was error to refuse defendant's challenges for cause to certain jurors who had served on a prior jury within one year of service on defendant's jury. Three of the impanelled jurors and six other veniremen stated on voir dire that they had served on other juries the week prior to defendant's trial. In each case, the jury service was performed not at a prior term of court, but during the term of the defendant's trial.

C.R.S. 1963, 78-5-2 provides:

> "The fact that any person summoned in any way to serve as a juror in any court of record shall have served as a juror in any of said courts, at any prior term, within one year next preceding, shall be sufficient excuse for such person from service, and may also be ground for challenge for cause to such individual summoned." (Emphasis added.)

The plain meaning of this statute is that a juror who has served at a prior term of any court of record, which term was within one year prior to the trial in question, is excusable for cause on this ground. It does not mean that a juror who has served within one year of defendant's trial, but in the same term of court is excusable on this ground. The jurors in question here were not subject to a successful challenge on the basis of this statute. See Denver Tramway Co. V. Kennedy, 50 Colo. 418, 117 P. 167 (1911).

II.

The defendant next asserts that it was error to allow the district attorney to death

qualify the jury. Several recent pronouncements of this court hold that it is not error to exclude from the jury those persons who state that they would not be able to consider and impose the death penalty under any circumstances because of religious, ethical or moral scruples against the death penalty. See English v. People, ____ Colo. ____, ____P. 2d____, Supreme Court No. 24000, announced May 30, 1972; Carroll v. People, ____ Colo. ____, 494 P. 2d 80 (1972); Padilla v. People, 171 Colo. 521, 470 P. 2d 846 (1970); Hampton v. People, 171 Colo. 153, 465 P. 2d 394 (1970); Atencio v. People, 147 Colo. 566, 364 P. 2d 575 (1961). These cases are controlling authority here.

The defendant's other contention of error regarding the selection and composition of the jury panel is without merit.

III.

Finally, the defendant contends that the court erred in allowing the prosecution to present a co-conspirator's incompetent and prejudicial testimony over the defendant's objection. The objection made to this testimony at trial by defendant's counsel was that it was incompetent because the co-conspirator had not yet been sentenced on his guilty plea and that the district attorney was holding this over the head of the witness. On appeal, the defendant's objection to the testimony is that the district attorney was allowed to elicit from the witness the fact that he was presently incarcerated in jail on charges of first-degree murder and conspiracy to commit murder. Later in his direct testimony, the witness stated that he had pleaded guilty to the

conspiracy charge because "I'm guilty of it and I plead guilty to it."

On cross-examination, defense counsel interrogated the witness about the charges pending against him and the reasons for the delay in sentencing. It is true that where the prosecution puts a co-defendant or co-conspirator on the stand and directly and deliberately elicits from him answers concerning his guilty plea to charges arising out of the same event that defendant is charged with, such testimony may be prejudicial and inadmissible against the defendant. Leech v. People, 112 Colo. 120, 146 P.2d 346 (1944); Paine v. People, 106 Colo. 258, 103 P.2d 686 (1940). It is also true, however, that this testimony must be considered in light of the entire case in order to determine its prejudicial effect, if any. In our view, while the prosecutor should not have elicited testimony concerning the witness' guilty plea, the evidence of defendant's guilt was so overwhelming as to make the reference to the guilty plea harmless error in this case. Harrington v. California, 395 U.S. 250, 89 S.Ct. 1726, 23 L.Ed.2d 284 (1969). This is especially true where defense counsel himself questioned the witness about this guilty plea in an effort to impeach his credibility.

Judgment affirmed.

Mr. Justice Erickson not participating.

APPENDIX B

Revised Statutes of the State of Colorado 1963:

40-2-3. Implied malice - degree of murder - plea of second degree murder permitted - when - penalty. -(1) Malice shall be implied when no considerable provocation appears, or when all circumstances of the killing show an abandoned and malignant heart. All murder which shall be perpetrated by means of poison or lying in wait, torture, or any kind of willful, deliberate and premeditated killing; or which is committed in the perpetration or attempt to perpetrate any arson, rape, robbery, mayhem, or burglary; or perpetrated from a deliberate, and premeditated design, unlawfully and maliciously, to effect the death of any human being other than him who is killed; or perpetrated by any act greatly dangerous to the lives of others and indicating a depraved mind, regardless of human life, shall be deemed murder of the first degree, and all other kinds of murder shall be deemed murder of the second degree. The jury before which any person indicted for murder shall be tried, shall, if it find such person guilty thereof, designate by its verdict whether it be murder of the first or second degree, and if murder of the first degree, the jury shall in its verdict fix the penalty to be suffered by the person so convicted, either at imprisonment for life at hard labor in the penitentiary, or at death; and the court shall thereupon give sentence accordingly.

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

OCTOBER TERM, 1972

No. 72-676

STEVEN LYLE CRAIG,
Petitioner,

v.

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF COLORADO,
Respondent.

ON PETITION FOR A WRIT OF CERTIORARI
TO THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF COLORADO

BRIEF FOR RESPONDENT IN OPPOSITION

INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT

The respondent accepts the petitioner's statements as to jurisdiction, date of judgment and time of entry, date of order granting an extension of time to file the petition for writ of certiorari, and statutes and constitutional provisions involved. The opinion below is appended to the petition and the unofficial citation is 498 P.2d 942 (Colo. 1972). The respondent desires to restate the questions presented and the statement of the case. References to the record will be by folio number (f. or ff.).

QUESTIONS PRESENTED

1. Was petitioner's right to trial by a fair and impartial jury violated by excluding veniremen who stated that their objections to capital punishment would interfere with their duties as jurors in determining petitioner's culpability or penalty when life imprisonment was the sentence imposed by the jury?

2. Was petitioner's right to trial by a fair and impartial jury violated when the array was selected solely from the list of registered voters?

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Petitioner was charged with murder and conspiracy to commit murder in the District Court of El Paso County, Colorado (ff. 3-5). To these charges pleas of not guilty were entered (ff. 36-37).

Prior to trial, petitioner moved to quash the array, alleging a denial of equal protection of the laws in the selection of the veniremen solely from the list of registered voters of El Paso County (ff. 104-106, 227, 234-238). The motion was denied (ff. 104-106, 224-225).

During *voir dire* seventeen prospective jurors were successfully challenged for cause over objection of Craig's trial counsel for their inability to subordinate their views opposing capital punishment in determining petitioner's culpability or punishment (ff. 277-278, 283, 285-286, 773, 818, 823, 829, 920-924, 1057-1059, 1143-1145, 1231-1234, 1333-1334, 1369-1373, 1540-1543, 1626-1629, 1717-1719, 1752-1754). One venireman was challenged for cause without objection by the people for his inability to impose only the

death penalty if Craig was convicted (ff. 1596-1598). The jury was sworn after petitioner had exhausted all his peremptory challenges (ff. 1803-1804).

Verdicts of guilty to first degree murder and conspiracy to commit murder were returned and the jury set petitioner's punishment at life imprisonment (ff. 166-168, 3207-3213).

ARGUMENT

I

THE COMPOSITION OF THE JURY DID NOT DENY PETITIONER A FAIR AND IMPARTIAL REPRESENTATIVE JURY AND THE SELECTION PROCESS DID NOT VIOLATE THE STANDARDS OF WITHERSPOON V. ILLINOIS.

Jurors selected at petitioner's trial were selected in meticulous compliance with the specific requirements of *Witherspoon v. Illinois*, 391 U.S. 510 (1968). No venireman was required to stand aside simply on the basis of his scruples against the death penalty. Each was questioned specifically as to his ability to serve as a juror in this case. Only those who indicated that their scruples would interfere with their ability to determine culpability or who could not subordinate their views in arriving at an appropriate punishment were excused. The *Witherspoon* rule has been the rule of Colorado almost from its admission into the union. *Stratton v. People*, 5 Colo. 276 (1880).

Data is presented by petitioner to establish that a jury selected as this jury was and composed of those who oppose the ultimate punishment is more prone to convict

than a jury consisting of those who were excluded.[1] The respondent submits that this evidence is not substantial or sufficient to reverse the conviction in the case at bar.

Further, the respondent submits that this case is controlled not by *Witherspoon, supra*, but by *Bumper v. North Carolina*, 391 U.S. 543 (1968).

Craig would have this Court now hold that these veniremen were arbitrarily excluded because of the recent decision of *Furman v. Georgia*, 92 S.Ct. 2726 (1972). Assuming arguendo the premise posited by petitioner's counsel that this Court has ruled unconstitutional the death penalty, the conclusion reached does not necessarily follow. *Furman* was decided on June 29, 1972, while trial in the present case was in May, 1970 (ff. 104-106). Respondent submits that Furman v. Georgia is not retroactive in application as to jury selection in capital cases.

This Court rejected the concept that new interpretations of the Constitution must be construed as always having been the law, disregarding or ignoring previous interpretations as if they never existed. *Williams v. United States*, 401 U.S. 646 (1971) and *Linkletter v. Walker*, 381 U.S. 618 (1965).

Criteria for determining whether new interpretations of the Constitution must be applied prospectively only, or retroactively as well, were specified in *Stovall, v. Denno*, 388 U.S. 293, 297 (1967). The criteria include the purpose of the new standards, reliance by law enforcement officials

[1] The data presented is two law review articles — Bronson, *On the Conviction Proneness and Representativeness of a Death Qualified Jury: An Empirical Study of Colorado Veniremen*, 42 U. Colo. L. Rev. 1 (1970) and Jurou, *New Data on the Effect of a Death Qualified Jury on the Guilt Determination Process*, 84 Harv. L. Rev. 567 (1971).

on the old standards, and the effect on the administration of justice. See also *Desist v. United States*, 394 U.S. 244, 249 (1969).

If petitioner prevails in his contention that *Furman* requires reversal of his conviction, the effect on the administration of justice would be vast. Not only would all defendants who have been sentenced to execution be entitled to new trials but those who did not receive the ultimate punishment would have to be given new trials. This might even include those who were charged with capital crimes but pleaded guilty or were convicted of lesser included crimes. In many of these new trials, convictions would be impossible for lack of witnesses, waning memories, prohibitive costs, etc.

In many of these situations, the trial courts and prosecuting attorneys relied on this Court's decision in *Witherspoon, supra,* and *Bumper, supra,* in conducting these trials. Assuming arguendo that this Court's holding in *Furman v. Georgia, supra,* declared the death penalty to be unconstitutional the purpose of the decision would be to eliminate the death penalty as a constitutionally permissible punishment and not to grant new trials to all capital defendants.

The overriding factor that must be considered in determining whether a decision should be applied in a retroactive manner is its effect on the fact finding process. *Williams v. United States, supra; Johnson v. New Jersey,* 384 U.S. 719 (1966); and *Linkletter v. Walker, supra.* The people of the State of Colorado submit that this manner of selecting a jury does not affect the fact finding process. In *Furman v. Georgia, supra,* only the punishment was re-

versed and not the culpability of those petitioners. Again in *Witherspoon* and *Bumper* the Court refused to overturn the guilty verdicts but would not allow execution. It cannot be said that the integrity of the fact finding process has been violated or that the state has crossed the line of neutrality in the selection of this jury.

II

THE ARRAY BEING COMPOSED OF ONLY REGISTERED VOTERS DID NOT DEPRIVE PETITIONER OF A FAIR, IMPARTIAL, AND REPRESENTATIVE JURY.

Petitioner would have this Court declare jury lists assembled from the list of registered voters unfair and nonrepresentative *per se*. It is Craig's position that no prejudice must be shown. There has been no showing made that the jury list used at petitioner's trial did not produce a jury which was a reasonable cross-section of the community. Without such a showing petitioner cannot assert this as a ground for a grant of certiorari.

This Court stated in *Carter v. Jury Commission of Greene County*, 396 U.S. 320, 332 (1970) citing *Brown v. Allen*, 344 U.S. 443, 474 (1953):

> Our duty to protect the federal constitutional rights of all does not mean we must or should impose on states our conception of the proper source of jury lists, so long as the source reasonably reflects a cross-section of the population suitable in character and intelligence for that civic duty.

Many federal and state courts have held that the use

of lists of registered voters to prepare jury lists is proper unless there is a showing that some group or groups are excluded utilizing this method. See for example: *United States v. James*, 453 F.2d 27 (9th Cir. 1971); *United States v. Parker*, 428 F.2d 488 (9th Cir. 1970), *cert. denied*, 400 U.S. 910 (1970); *United States v. Dangler*, 422 F.2d 344 (5th Cir. 1970); *United States v. Butera*, 420 F.2d 564 (1st Cir. 1970); *Kemp v. United States*, 415 F.2d 1185 (5th Cir. 1969), *reh. denied*, 419 F.2d 383 (5th Cir. 1969), *cert. denied*, 397 U.S. 969 (1970); *Camp v. United States*, 413 F.2d 419 (5th Cir. 1969), *cert. denied*, 396 U.S. 968 (1969); *Simmons v. United States*, 406 F.2d 456 (5th Cir. 1969), *cert. denied*, 395 U.S. 982 (1969), *reh. denied*, 396 U.S. 871 (1969); *United States v. Caci*, 401 F.2d 664 (2d Cir. 1968), *cert. denied*, 394 U.S. 917 (1969); *Nolan v. United States*, 395 F.2d 283 (5th Cir. 1968); *Grimes v. United States*, 391 F.2d 709 (5th Cir. 1968), *cert. denied*, 393 U.S. 825 (1968); *United States v. Kelly*, 349 F.2d 720 (2d Cir. 1965); *People v. Sirhan*, 7 Cal. 3d 369, 497 P.2d 1121, 102 Cal. Rptr. 385 (1972); *Johnson v. Caldwell*, 228 Ga. 776, 187 S. E. 2d 844 (1972); *State v. Curry*, 262 La. 280, 263 So. 2d 36 (1972); *People v. Sinclair*, 30 Mich. App. 473, 186 N. W. 2d 767 (1971); *State ex rel. Bush v. Tahash*, 281 Minn. 244, 161 N. W. 2d 326 (1968); *State v. Parker*, 462 S. W. 2d 737 (Mo. 1971); *State v. Casados*, 188 Neb. 91, 195 N. W. 2d 210 (1972); *State v. Smith*, 102 N. J. Super., 325, 246 A. 2d 35 (1968); and *State v. Zdiarstek*, 53 Wis. 2d 776, 193 N. W. 2d 833 (1972).

There is nothing inherently discriminatory in the use of poll lists in preparing jury lists. If a showing of prejudice is made, then such lists should be discarded or supplemented, but no such showing was made here.

CONCLUSION

Therefore, the respondent urges this Court to deny the petition for a writ of certiorari. The arguments presented show conclusively that the decision of the Colorado Supreme Court was correct and should not be disturbed.

Respectfully submitted,

DUKE W. DUNBAR
Attorney General

JOHN P. MOORE
Deputy Attorney General

RICHARD G. MCMANUS, JR.
Assistant Attorney General

104 State Capitol
Denver, Colorado 80203
Telephone: 303-892-2595

Attorneys for Respondent